

Transportation and Small Business Consortium

Aviation and Small Business Consortium Inc. Post Office Box 986 Lake Geneva, WI 53147-0986 262-723-4650 262-723-4651 Fax www asbc-tsbc com dean@asbc-tsbc com

November 14,2002

Docket Management System
US Department of Transportation
Room Plaza 401
400 7 Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590

OST-2002-13435

I would like to commend the DOT in trying to make the DCT and Alcohol Testing programs easier for the employers and Service Agents to comply with the rules. Because there are a lot of C/TPA's who provide MIS reporting as a part of the services we offer to our clients and because a lot of the C/TPA also provide services to more then one operating agency, using one MIS form will make things a little easier. But with trying to make things simpler I think that there are a few problems with the report;

- Not included in the NPRM is when this "new" MIS report format will be used I think the changes would be excellent for the 2003 MIS reports that would be due in March 2004 This would leave time for those of us who depend on a computer program to have the appropriate changes accomplished and tested before implementation I think that if the DOT would require this new format to be used for the 2002 MIS reports that would be due in March 2003, it would cause a major problem with the accuracy and the timely submission of the report
- 2 I think that the instructions on the MIS form are excellent. Especially the way the "average number of employees" is explained It there has always been problems and misunderstandings in the industry on how the average number of employees is figured out I think the way that is explained is the best way to figure out the average number of employees, not at the beginning of the year or the middle of the year This will allow for the best-managed random program
- 3 **Because the "new" MIS** form deletes some of the **information** that has been required in the past and the **note** in the *NPRM* **says**, that the information that has been deleted will be available **during** audits and inspections **There should be** some discussion on what **information the** employer **IS REQUIRED to track** for **future** inspection
- 4 I think that the availability for the MIS reports to be submitted electronically is a step in the **right** direction. There **will** be **some** issues that must be addressed to ensure **that** the **data** is not lost **and** the data is accurate
- 5 What is not clear in the NPRM, is how to account for an employee who is covered by multi-modal requirements and how those tests will be counted. There needs to be a better explanation as to this requirement.





I do see some problems in the NPRM or areas that need to be clarified a lot better

- I. The idea behind the "One MIS report" is an excellent idea, but when it requires some modes to have more paperwork, that is a problem. With FAA clients that have more then one category of covered employee, I see the sheer number of MIS reports that must be submitted. I represent some smaller companies who have 2-4 types of covered employees, this will require more paperwork then we currently have to provide. I think that even if the DOT needs to make the MIS report a 2-page report, actually cutting down the overall paperwork is necessary.
- 2. My biggest concern with the NPRM is leaving a blank empty when no test has been done. How can you expect accuracy when you will not be able to say if the person filling at the form forgot to put a number in the box? I have always been told on any government form you must put something in all boxes and NOT to leave an empty box, So this item should be changed to require ALL boxes to have a number in it, or a "0".

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to comment on this NRPM. 1 always try to convince the members and people who are affected by the NPRM to make comments. I think this is the best way that we have to make a difference in how the Drug and Alcohol Testing Industry changes.

Dean Klassy Sr. R-CPCT

COO